



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"We are in a bad way on this side of the Atlantic! For years I have fought against this continued occupation of Egypt; but we have hoped and hoped that the government would 'come out of Egypt,' as they always said they would. And now the prospect of their doing so seems more distant than ever, if they undertake the conquest and 'civilization' of the Soudan. The design seems to me fraught with many dangers and with terrible responsibilities. The British public at large think that the great services which we have undoubtedly rendered to the Fellaheen, and to Egypt generally, make it our duty to remain; but is it our duty to undertake the protection and regeneration of foreign lands, at the cost of our good name for fidelity to promises, at the costs of wars, and of making an enemy of France? I do not think so."

Nor do we think so. Great Britain ought at once to fulfil her oft-repeated pledges and give up the occupation of Egypt; that is, if the continued occupation of the country has to be accompanied by a constant national lie. It is of course possible, and even probable, that if she would once for all put herself in an honorable and frank relation to France on the subject, she might remain without polluting herself with falsehood. But she is almost certain not to do this, just as she is certain to continue the false military policy which has forced her into the Dongola expedition.

Of the Italian colonial enterprise in Abyssinia, there is not a favorable syllable to be said. There is no good in it, nor has there ever been. Those Italians are right who demand that the whole thing shall be abandoned. But Cæsar is still imperator in Rome, as of old.

France prides herself in holding control of the whole northwest quarter of Africa. But what has she done for African civilization? For Dahomey, for instance, or any other part of the vast territory? Yet she would like to get the mastery of the whole continent. She is jealous of England for every foot of territory the latter controls. She wants it herself. That is why the ill-feeling in France is so great toward England on account of recent English movements in Egypt, and were it not that the French government is so absorbed with the question of taxation, nobody can tell how soon the smouldering fire might break forth.

Russia is said to have armed king Menelek's forces; Germany is "interested" in the success of the Transvaal; England is said to be about to "pour troops" into South Africa; Delagoa Bay does not yet know who is finally to have it. And so the poor continent is everywhere the prey of European greed, hatred and aggression, utterly unworthy of nations claiming to possess even a small modicum of Christian character.

The ravages of the Cuban war still continue. In spite of all the efforts of the Spanish forces, the insurgents are as strong to-day as ever, being constantly recruited by filibusters.

BUSINESS AND WAR.

Mr. Chauncey M. Depew has recently returned from a trip through the West. He reports that he found business everywhere generally depressed and that this depression was attributed primarily to the war scares. There had been a general revival of business in the fall, but this had been suddenly checked by the unsettled conditions at Washington.

What Mr. Depew found to be true of the West is true of the whole country. The panic in the stock market on the 18th and 19th of December, by which it was estimated that a thousand millions of dollars was lost, was of short duration and could easily have been borne, as it affected principally but one class of persons. But this panic was immediately followed by a feeling of general uneasiness throughout the country, which has seriously affected and continues to affect more or less every department of business. Nor are we likely, from present indications, very soon to rally from its disturbing effects. The mischief of it all is that the burden falls most heavily where it is hardest to bear, that is, upon the working classes.

Is the commercial argument against war and war-scares a legitimate one? It is confessedly a powerful one, and has been employed during the last few weeks with great effectiveness. But is it right to use it? Is it a worthy, manly, patriotic argument, or a low, mercenary one? That it is the latter has been asserted from two entirely different if not opposite points of view.

It has been charged, on the one hand, by some of the friends of peace, that the recent widespread manifestation of sentiment in both this country and Great Britain against an Anglo-American war has no moral significance but has proceeded from purely mercenary motives. On the other hand, it has been insinuated that commercial considerations, which have been assumed to lie at the basis of the anti-war demonstration, are unworthy of patriots, who ought to be ready to uphold the dignity and honor of their country at whatever financial sacrifices. Business men, business houses, and chambers of commerce have been accused of selfishness and meanness of spirit because they have protested emphatically and almost unanimously against the recent flippant jingoistic war-talk.

The charge that the movement to prevent war and to render it forevermore impossible between people of Anglo-Saxon blood had its origin in mercenary motives is not true. The business interests of the country were not the first to speak out nor have they been the chief support of the movement, though they have done their part nobly and effectively.

But, after all, is not the business argument against war a moral argument of a very high order? Certainly it seems to us to be so. It may be granted that if war

were ever right on purely ethical and Christian grounds, or obligatory in the higher interests of nations and of mankind, commercial considerations ought in that case to be entirely discarded. It is conceded also that war ought to be opposed primarily because it is morally wrong and inhuman, not because it is financially ruinous.

But we doubt if it be possible to consider the commercial grounds of opposition to war apart from the moral. They make up a part of the moral argument, and a very important part. The loss and crippling of men in war greatly diminishes the productive and trading power of a country. Large numbers of widows and orphans are thrown helpless upon the support of the nation, or left to shift for themselves, with what results to their own character and to the morals of society is only too well known. The bankruptcies and other business disturbances brought on by war and war-scares throw multitudes of families out of employment and often spoil their business prospects for life. The national debts growing out of wars saddle immense and troublesome burdens on coming generations. Private property, often of the perfectly innocent, is destroyed by millions.

The general and widespread disturbance of business, besides creating a strain which often proves to be a powerful incentive to crime and wickedness, interferes with all work for the moral and spiritual improvement of society. The evangelizing work of the church languishes for lack of funds, as well as for other reasons. Educational enterprises of all kinds are crippled. In brief, when war lays its bloody, greedy hand upon the purse of society, it blasts with its deadly touch every interest of the social body, higher as well as lower. It is one of the best known facts of history that a period of war is not only a period of financial wreck and ruin, but of moral and spiritual degeneration as well, and that the latter is in no small measure dependent on the former.

If all this does not constitute a moral argument of great force against war, there certainly is none from a practical standpoint. Any one who can lightly talk of war, having before him all these possible disasters growing out of financial disturbance, has not a particle of patriotism in him, but is through and through an enemy to his country and to all its citizens.

The complexity and world-wide character of business relations in our day make the possible disasters from war indefinitely greater and more far-reaching in their consequences than in former times. Mere talk of war has come to be the deadly enemy of the world's commerce, and through this of every social and intellectual and moral blessing. Business men may therefore well come to the front to help to smother down the very first whispers of war. They would disgrace their calling, if they should do otherwise. If business should succeed in killing war, we should not weep the least that it had not been slain by a better foe.

THE BRITISH NAVAL BUDGET.

PEACE SOCIETY'S APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

The London Peace Society has sent the following powerful appeal to the citizens of Great Britain. It ought to fall like a trumpet blast on their ears and arouse them to a sense of the danger ahead, not only for Great Britain but for all the nations, if the present rivalry of armaments continues.

But it will fall for the most part on deaf ears. The British government, like all others, still believes that "brute force is the final law of society." Even Mr. Gladstone, who said recently that "England has to bear no small share of responsibility for the monstrous and barbarous militarism of Europe," when in power never lifted a finger in direct opposition to it. The British naval power went on growing under his authority and with his approval. Great Britain is, in her way, just as barbarous in her militarism as the rest. She piously boasts of her freedom from the Continental land-system of militarism, but she has increased her guilt on the sea until she is the greatest sinner of them all.

It is through this marine barbarism that she is exercising such a monstrous influence for evil. Wherever her naval power goes she provokes those with whom she comes in contact to imitate her, and when this cannot be done at sea it is done on land. Even our own country, throughout which there has been such strong opposition to military development, even on the sea, is gradually yielding to her influence. We say her influence, for it is her naval extension more than anything else which has provoked naval extension on this side. This is the argument constantly used by the jingoists and by many, who, though not jingoists, are still "conformed to this world," and "walk by fear." Our four new battle-ships and fifteen torpedo boats, which the House of Representatives has just authorized, are probably only the beginning of a much larger naval extension, which there is, we are pained to say, not enough of conscience and good sense in the nation to prevent. And this has been provoked chiefly by England's great war fleet, which will some day be her humiliation, if not her ruin. Let her, as this appeal entreats, begin to save herself from ultimate disaster and disgrace by "reversing this mistaken and fatal policy of nations."

THE APPEAL.

March, 1896.

FELLOW COUNTRYMEN,—Less than two years ago a memorial was promoted with the knowledge and sympathy of the leaders of both the political parties in this country, asking "that communications should be opened with the European Powers, in order to ascertain whether it may not be possible, as a first step toward arresting the further growth of national armaments, and reducing burdens already almost intolerable, to secure a common and general agreement that, until the close of the century, no